UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/532,412	03/22/2000	Jonathan J. Hull	74451.P115	8317

7590   12/31/2002

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA   90025

EXAMINER
KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11/21/02_ .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-40_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-40_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 11/21/02.

This action is final.

2.   Claims 1-40 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 29, 33 and 37 are

independent claims.   The present title of the invention is "Melded user interfaces" as originally

filled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-26, 28-30, 32-34, 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Stucka et al. (US 5,596,702).

As per independent claim 1, Stucka et al. teaches a method comprising:

Extracting a first data from a display buffer, the first data generated by a first application

and being associated with a user interface from the first application; (col 23 lines 62-67, col 24

lines 37-60)

Recognizing a layout from the first data; and

Using the layout to create an overlay to display a second data generated by a second

application (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5), wherein there is no direct link between the

first application and the second application (col 4, lines 64-67, col 5, lines 1-2).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Stucka et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein recognizing the layout comprises performing a pattern recognition operation on the first data to create the layout (col 23 lines 62-67, col 24 lines 37-60).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Stucka et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein using the layout to create the overlay comprises:

Determining an overlay location on the layout to place the second data

Based on known information about the layout;

Generating the overlay of the layout;

Placing the second data in the overlay; and

Merging the overlay with the layout. (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Stucka et al. teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the overlay location has a context consistent with the second data (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Stucka et al. teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the context is provided by the first application, and wherein a user interacts with the second application using the context (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim1, Stucka et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

Writing the overlay in the display buffer such that the second data is displayed at the overlay location without changing sections of the first data outside of the overlay location (col 23 lines 62-67, col 24 lines 37-60);

Displaying information in the display buffer; and

Interacting with the second application through the second data at the overlay location (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per claim 7, which dependent on claim 1, Stucka et al. teaches the method of claim 6, further comprising running the first application in the background while interacting with the second application (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per claim 8, which dependent on claim 1, Stucka et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first application runs independently from the second application (col 4, lines 64-67, col 5, lines 1-2).

As per independent claim 9, Stucka et al. teaches a machine-readable medium providing instructions, which when executed by a set of one or more processors, cause said set of processors to perform the following:

Extracting a first data from a display buffer, the first data generated by a first application and being associated with a user interface from the first application; (col 23 lines 62-67, col 24 lines 37-60)

Recognizing a layout from the first data; and

Using the layout to create an overlay to display a second data generated by a second application (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5), wherein there is no direct link between the first application and the second application (col 4, lines 64-67, col 5, lines 1-2).

As per claim10, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (See rejection above)

As per claim11, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 3. (See rejection above)

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 4. (See rejection above)

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 5. (See rejection above)

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 6. (See rejection above)

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, it is of the same scope as claim 7. (See rejection above)

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 8. (See rejection above)

As per independent claim 17, Stucka et al. teaches a computer system, comprising:

A bus;

A data storage device coupled to the bus; and

A processor coupled to the data storage device, the processor operable to receive instructions which, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to perform a method comprising (col 30, lines 32-50):

Extracting a first data from a display buffer, the first data generated by a first application and being associated with a user interface from the first application;

Recognizing a layout from the first data (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5); and

Using the layout to create an overlay to display a second data (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5)

Generated by a second application, wherein there is no direct link between the first

application and the second application (col 4 lines 64-67, col 5 lines 1-2).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (See

rejection above)

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 17, it is of the same scope as claim 3. (See

rejection above)

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 17, it is of the same scope as claim 4. (See

rejection above)

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 17, it is of the same scope as claim 5. (See

rejection above)

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 17, it is of the same scope as claim 6. (See

rejection above)

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 22, it is of the same scope as claim 7. (See

rejection above)

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 17, it is of the same scope as claim 8. (See

rejection above)

As per independent claim 25, Stucka et al. a method, comprising:

Modifying data in a display buffer that is generated by a first application with data

generated by a second application, the first application running independently from the second

application (col 23 lines 62-67, col 24 lines 37-60); and

Receiving input in response to user interactions with the second application through a

user interface associated with the data generated by the first application, wherein the data

generated by the second application is placed in a location in the user interface, wherein the

location is contextually consistent with the data generated by the second application (col 26,

lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25, Stucka et al. teaches the method of

claim 25, wherein modifying data in the display buffer comprises:

Performing a pattern recognition operation on the data generated by the first application

to create a layout (col 23 lines 62-67, col 24 lines 37-60); and

Forming an overlay with the layout and with predetermined information about a display

corresponding to the user interface, the overlay used to determine placement of the data

generated by the second application in the display (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 26, it is of the same scope of claim 7. (See

rejection above)

As per independent claim 29, Stucka et al. teaches a machine-readable medium providing

instructions, which when executed by a set of one or more processors, cause said set of

processors to perform the following:

Modifying data in a display buffer that is generated by a first application with data

generated by a second application, the first application running independently from the second

application (col 4 lines 64-67, col 5 lines 1-2); and

Receiving input in response to user interactions with the second application through a

user interface associated with the data generated by the first application (col 23 lines 62-67, col

24 lines 37-60), wherein the data generated by the second application is placed in a location in

the user interface, wherein the location is contextually consistent with the data generated by the

second application (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of the same scope of claim 26. (See

rejection above)

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of the same scope of claim 7. (See

rejection above)

As per independent claim 33, Stucka et al. teaches a computer system, comprising:

A bus;

A data storage device coupled to the bus (col 30, lines 32-50); and

A processor coupled to the data storage device, the processor operable to receive

instructions which, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to perform a method

comprising: modifying data in a display buffer that is generated by a first application with data

generated by a second application, the first application running independently from the second

application (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5); and

Receiving input in response to user interactions with the second application through a

user interface associated with the data generated by the first application, wherein the data

generated by the second application is placed in a location in the user interface, wherein the

location is contextually consistent with the data generated by the second application (col 26,

lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per independent claim 34, Stucka et al. teaches the computer system of claim 33,

wherein modifying data in the display buffer comprises:

Performing a pattern recognition operation on the data generated by the first application to create a layout (col 23 lines 62-67, col 24 lines 37-60); and

Forming an overlay with the layout and with predetermined information about a display corresponding to the user interface, the overlay used to determine placement of the data generated by the second application in the display (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 34, it is of the same scope of claim 7. (See rejection above)

As per independent claim 37, Stucka et al. teaches a method comprising:

Reading raster data from a raster display buffer containing an image generated by a first application;

Performing a pattern recognition on the image to generate a pattern (col 23 lines 62-67, col 24 lines 37-60);

Applying predetermined information about the image with the pattern to determine a layout of the image;

Generating an overlay using the layout of the image; and

Placing data generated by a second application on the overlay (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 37, Stucka et al. teaches the method of claim 37, further comprising writing the overlay into the raster display buffer (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 37, Stucka et al. teaches the method of claim 37, wherein the image comprises a user interface from the first application, and wherein a

user interacts with the second application through the user interface while the first application

runs in the background (col 4, lines 64-67, col 5, lines 1-2).

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 39, Stucka et al. teaches the method of

claim 39, wherein while the user interacts with the second application, the first application has

no control of input received from the user (col 4, lines 64-67, col 5, lines 1-2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 27, 31, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Stucka et al. (US. 5,596,702) in view of Kahl et al. (U.S 5,936,625).

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 26, Stucka et al. teaches claim 26, however

he doesn't teach layout comprises of grid cells corresponding to display areas in the user

interface, and wherein the data generated by the second application is placed in the grid cell.

Kahl et al. teaches a graphical user interface layout comprises of grid cell corresponding to

display areas in the user interface (See fig. 3). It would be have been obvious to an artisan at the

time of the invention to include Kahl's teaching with the method of Stucka et al. in order to

transfer graphical user interface from one calendar to that of another calendar.

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 30, it is of the same scope as claim 27. (See

rejection above).

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 34, it is of the same scope as claim 27. (See rejection above).

Response to Amendment

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/21/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's first argument regarding the Stucka's reference is that Stucka doesn't teach "extracting a first data from a display buffer". The examiner does not agree because Stucka extracts a first data from a display buffer (Fig 2, col 8, lines 8-26).

Applicant's second argument regarding the Stucka's reference is that Stucka doesn't teach "recognizing a lay out from the first data". The examiner does not agree because Stucka recognizes a lay out from the first data (col 23, lines 62-67, col 24, lines 37-60). The examiner infers to the fact that command parameter data required to initialize user interface components such as background and foreground color are part of the lay out from the first data.

Applicant's third argument regarding the Stucka's reference is that Stucka doesn't teach "using the layout to create an overlay to display a second data generated by a second application, wherein there is no direct link between the first application and the second application". The examiner does not agree because Stucka uses the layout to create an overlay to display a second data generated by a second application (col 26, lines 66-67, col 27, lines 1-5), wherein there is no direct link between the first application and the second application (col 4, lines 64,67, col 5, lines 1-2). The examiner is inferring that upon receiving input in response to user interactions, Stucka creates an overlay base on the data generated by another application (Fig 7a, 7b). This process of storing and retrieving interfaces is also explicitly stated in column 17, between lines 1-20.

Applicant's fourth argument regarding Stucka's reference is that Stucka doesn't teach "modifying data in a display buffer that is generated by a first application with data generated by a second application, the first application running independently from the second application". The examiner doesn't agree because Stucka modifies the data in a display buffer that is generated by a first application with a stored data (col 23 lines 62-67, col 24 lines 37-60), which is obvious generated by another application and stored by the user. (col 17, lines 5-12).

Application's fifth argument regarding Stucka's reference is that Stucka doesn't teach "receiving input in response to user interactions with the second application through a user associated with the data generated by the first application." The examiner doesn't agree because Stucka allows the user to select an interface, which is stored from the second application, to be placed over that of the first application (col 26, lines 55-67, col 27, lines 1-5).

Application's sixth argument regarding Stucka's reference is that Stucka doesn't teach "reading raster data from a raster display buffer containing an image generated by a first application" and "performing a pattern recognition on the image to generate a pattern". The examiner doesn't agree because Stucka extracts a first data from a display buffer (Fig 2, col 8, lines 8-26). Furthermore, Stucka recognizes a lay out from the first data (col 23, lines 62-67, col 24, lines 37-60). The examiner infers to the fact that command parameter data required to initialize user interface components such as background and foreground color are part of the lay out pattern from the first data.

Conclusion

9.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**   Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS

from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed with TWO MONTHS of

the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on

the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailed date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100